

REMARKS

In the outstanding Final Office Action, claims 1-4 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) over HIGUCHI et al. (U.S. Patent Application Publication No. 2001/0022612) in view of NAKASHIMA et al. (U.S. Patent Application Publication No. 2001/0015754). Claims 5-9 and 13 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) over HIGUCHI in view of NAKASHIMA, and further in view of WADA (U.S. Patent No. 7,053,926). Claims 10-12 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) over HIGUCHI in view of ADAIR (U.S. Patent Application Publication No. 2006/0022234). Claim 13 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) over NAKASHIMA in view of HIGUCHI.

Applicant traverses the rejections of claims 1-13 under 35 U.S.C. §103. Upon entry of the present amendment, claims will have been amended to recite that the blanking interval in which a region of the generated digital video signal is included is a horizontal blanking interval. The digitized information in claim 1 and the control information in claim 13 is superimposed in the region included in the horizontal blanking interval. These features of the invention to which the pending claims are directed are disclosed at, e.g., paragraphs [0054 and [0055], of the publication of the present application (i.e., U.S. Patent Application Publication No. 20040196364).

In contrast, neither HIGUCHI, NAKASHIMA, WADA or ADAIR discloses such features. Rather, NAKASHIMA discloses at, e.g., Figure 4 and paragraph [0058], only that digitized information is superimposed in a region included in a vertical blanking interval. If HIGUCHI were therefore modified with the teachings of NAKASHIMA, a greater time lag between operation of an operable member and output of a control signal would occur in comparison to the invention to which the pending claims are directed, due

to a longer interval. Accordingly, superimposition of digitized information in a region included in the horizontal blanking interval is reduced, according to the invention to which the pending claims are directed, relative to a result that would be obtained by HIGUCHI as modified with teachings of NAKASHIMA.

Accordingly, independent claims 1 and 13 are allowable over the documents applied in the Final Office Action, whether these documents are applied alone or in any proper combination. Dependent claims 2-12 are allowable over these documents at least for depending, directly or indirectly, from an allowable independent claim, as well as for additional reasons related to their own recitations. Accordingly, reconsideration and withdrawal of each of the outstanding rejections is respectfully requested.

Any amendments to the claims which have been made in this amendment, and which have not been specifically noted to overcome a rejection based upon the prior art, should be considered to have been made for a purpose unrelated to patentability, and no estoppel should be deemed to attach thereto.

Should the Examiner have any questions, the Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned at the below-listed telephone number.

Respectfully Submitted,
Akihiro TAKAHASHI



Bruce H. Bernstein
Reg. No. 29,027

Joshua M. Povsner
Reg. #42,086

July 15, 2008
GREENBLUM & BERNSTEIN, P.L.C.
1950 Roland Clarke Place
Reston, VA 20191
(703) 716-1191